UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/560,434	04/27/2000	Keshaba Chandra Sahoo	30566.90US01	4313

22462   7590   08/12/2003

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER
LE, MIRANDA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _27 April 2000_ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-12_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-12_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 05/23/2003.

2.   Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 9 are independent claims. In

the Amendment A, no claim has been cancelled, added, and amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kish et al. (US Patent No. 5,890,176), in view of Gerard et al. (US Patent No. 5,974,428).

As per claims 1, 5, 9, Kish teaches "obtaining a request to store an object" at col. 2, lines

20-34, col. 5, lines 4-21, col. 13, lines 46-54;

"determining if a requested file version is lower than an object introduction version of the

object" at col. 2, lines 20-44, col. 10, lines 42-59;

"streaming out a class of the object in the requested file version if the requested file

version is equal to or higher than the object introduction version; and streaming out the class of

the object in the object introduction version if the requested file version is lower than the object

introduction version" at col. 2, lines 26-29, col. 10, lines 14-16, col. 10, lines 45-51.

Kish does not explicitly teach "streaming out a class of the object", however, Gerard

teaches this limitation at col. 3, lines 32-46, col. 5, lines 21-32, col. 8, lines 30-67, Fig. 4.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Kish with the teachings of Gerard to include "streaming

out a class of the object" in order to provide an improved method and mechanism for tracking

and managing the changing definitions and implementations of multiple class versions in an

object-oriented environment.

Moreover, as per claim 5, Kish teaches "an object-oriented computer system having a

memory and a data storage device coupled thereto" at col. 3, lines 8-37.

As per claims 3, 7, 11, Kish teaches "one or more superior objects of the object querying

the object to determine a version to stream out" at col. 6, lines 22-47, col. 8, lines 3-15, col. 8,

lines 23-34, col. 11, lines 36-50;

Kish teaches "the object responding to stream out in the requested file version if the

requested file version is equal to or higher than the object introduction version" at col. 11, lines

36-50, col. 7, lines 14-42, col. 6, lines 22-39. Gerard teaches this at col. 7, lines 30-66.

Kish teaches "the object responding to stream out in the object introduction version if the

requested file version is lower than the object introduction version" at col. 7, lines 14-42, col. 11,

lines 36-50, col. 5, lines 4-21. Gerard teaches this at col. 7, lines 30-66.

Kish teaches "the one or more superior objects of the object streaming out in accordance with the object response" at col. 7, line 62 to col. 8, line 16, col. 13, lines 46-54, col. 11, lines 36-50.

As per claims 4, 8, 12, Kish teaches "obtaining a request to store an object is initialized by saving a file containing the object" at col. 2, lines 20-34, col. 7, line 62 to col. 8, line 16, col. 13, lines 46-54.

5.   Claims 2, 6, 10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kish et al. (US Patent No. 5,890,176), in view of Gerard et al. (US Patent No. 5,974,428), as applied to claims above, and further in view of Cohen et al. (US Patent No. 6,324,543 B1).

As per claims 2, 6, 10, neither Kish nor Gerard teach "representing the object as a proxy object when a file is opened, and wherein the streaming out in the object introduction version comprises: the proxy object holding onto the object's data; and the proxy object streaming out the object's data". However, Cohen teaches these limitations at col. 6, lines 57-67, col. 5, lines 51-59.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kish, Gerard with the teaching of Cohen to include "the requested file version is lower than the object introduction version, the method further comprising representing the object as a proxy object when a file is opened, and wherein the streaming out in the object introduction version comprises: the proxy object holding onto the

object's data; and the proxy object streaming out the object's data" in order to provide a method

for allowing programs to become dynamically reconfigurable without programmer intervention.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 05/23/2003 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant argues that:

(1) Neither Kisk, Gerard, nor Cohen teach, disclose or suggest streaming out a class of an

object.

(2) Neither Kisk, Gerard, nor Cohen teach, disclose or suggest streaming out a class in a

requested file version if the requested file version is equal to or higher than the object

introduction version.

(3) Neither Kisk, Gerard, nor Cohen teach, disclose or suggest streaming out a class of an

object in the object introduction version if the requested file version is lower than the object

introduction version.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees for the following reasons:

Per (1), as discussed in the above rejection, Gerard teaches when a request for a new

object is received, a class must be loaded to support that request (col. 8, lines 39-43), the request

is sent to the VersionLoader object which utilizes a mapping mechanism (col. 8, lines 43-47),

and the mapping mechanism support a versioning policy that determines which class to return

(col. 8, lines 48-51). It is thus clearly shown by Gerard the step of streaming out a class of an object.

Per (2), the Applicant's invention discloses a method for storing object data of a requested file in an object-oriented computer system. Similarly, Kish reference teaches an object-oriented document version tracking method wherein a single file holds multiple versions of a document composed of an interconnection of objects which themselves have versions and are stored in the file (see Abstract). When the document is changed by changing any of the interconnected objects, a check is first made to determine whether the object version is the same as the document version currently being edited (i.e. determining if a requested file version is lower than an object introduction version of the object). If not (i.e. whether it is equal or higher), a copy of the object is made and saved (i.e. the object is streamed out in the file version), (col. 2, lines 26-29) and if there is not an object version corresponding to active document version (i.e. the file version is older than when the object was introduced), the objects has inherited the object version from the previous document version (i.e. the object is streamed out in the object introduction version) (col. 10, lines 14-16), the object then must be structure so that any time one of these methods is called, the object checks to determine whether it is the current version. In a preferred embodiment, checking the existing version is performed by a common method in the base class CEngineObject called CheckVersion (col. 10, lines 45-51). Therefore, any version of the document can be reconstructed by interconnecting object versions which have a highest level which is equal to or less than the desired document version, so only objects which are changed

are duplicated and <u>copies of objects are only made</u> (i.e. storing object data in a particular version)

<u>when an object changes</u>.

Although Kish teaches streaming out an object (col. 2, lines 20-34), Kish does not

explicitly teach the step of "streaming out a class of the object". Gerard, however, teaches this

limitation as discussed in (1). More specifically, Gerard teaches selecting the most recent or best

version of the requested class and return an object to the user or requesting object that belongs to

the approved class (col. 3, lines 36-46). It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in

the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kish with the teaching of Gerard

to include "streaming out a class of the object" in order to provide a system to have multiple

versions of the same class on-line at the same time and to create and use objects from different

version of the same class, as taught by Gerard at col. 3, lines 39-42.

Per (3), under similar rational as provided in (1), and (2) in light of Fig. 4, the same

reasoning would be applicable to streaming out a class of the object. Arguments as raised are

moot since all claim limitations relevant to this issue have been addressed accordingly.

In addtion, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e.,

Gerard teaches a methodology that does not use a class hierarchy) is not recited in the rejected

claim. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the

specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26

USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-3203. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax number to this Art Unit

is (703) 746-7238.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be

directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Miranda Le

August 8, 2003

GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER